

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,897	03/30/2004	Bruce W. Tryon	5704.00209	2896
<sup>26659</sup> RAGGIO & DI	7590 07/06/2007 NNIN. P.C.	·	EXAMINER	
2701 CAMBRIDGE COURT, STE. 410 AUBURN HILLS, MI 48326			BEHNCKE, CHRISTINE M	
AUBURN HIL	LS, MII 48320		ART UNIT	
	•	3661		
	*	•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/708,897	TRYON, BRUCE W.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Christine M. Behncke	3661		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	V IC CET TO EVOIDE 4 MONTH	(C) OD TUUDTY (20) DAYO		
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Dansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Diperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ourse to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 M	larch 2004.			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	•	•		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
=	Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	ala atta a sassa tua sassa t			
0)[	Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> are subject to restriction and/or of	election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	•			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •		
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	• •			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage		
* (	application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.		
			·		
Attachmer	nt(s)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summan			
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal			
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· ····································		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-23 (Subgroups A/B/C), drawn to methods of controlling a hybrid electric vehicle incorporating a recuperated turbine engine, classified in class 701, subclass 99.
- II. Claims 24-54 (Subgroups D/E), drawn to methods and apparatus of determining a likely destination of a vehicle, classified in class 701, subclass 200.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination Group II has separate utility such as a navigation component of any type of vehicle, the invention does not require being used in a hybrid vehicle, to determine likely routing data for traffic presentation or routing presentation. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a

Art Unit: 3661

continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

## **UPON ELECTION OF GROUP I ONLY:**

Applicant is further required to elect one of the following Subgroups:

A. Claims 1-6, drawn to method of controlling the fuel flow of a hybrid electric vehicle in anticipation of shutting down a recuperated turbine engine, classified in class 701, subclass 99.

- B. Claims 7-11, drawn to a method of monitoring a recuperated turbine engine, shutting off a fuel flow to the turbine engine, and resuming the fuel flow at a prior time to when a condition would indicate that the turbine engine would not likely start without requiring a source of energy external to the turbine engine, classified in class 701, subclass 29.
- C. Claims 12-23, drawn to a method of determining a location of the vehicle, a measure responsive to an amount of energy required for the reaching a destination, and reducing a power generated by a power generator response to the measure in advance of the vehicle reaching the destination, classified in class 701, subclass 123.

Inventions of Subgroups A, B, and C are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombinations A and B have separate utility from C such as merely power control of the hybrid vehicle, which does not require the determination of a destination or location. Subcombination B has separate utility from A and C such as merely monitoring a condition of a turbine engine and in particular when to resume the fuel flow to prevent the need for external assistance in starting. See MPEP § 806.05(d). Subcombination C has separate utility from A and B such as a method of energy conservation, by determining the amount of energy required to reach a destination.

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

## **UPON ELECTION OF GROUP I ONLY:**

Applicant is further required to elect one of the following Subgroups:

- Claims 24-34, drawn to a method of determining a likely destination of a vehicle, classified in class 701, subclass 200.
- E. Claims 35-54, drawn to a method and apparatus of determining a likely second and third destination based upon driving patterns, classified in class 701, subclass 205.

Inventions D and E are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require

Art Unit: 3661

the use of driving patterns to determine likely destination, nor requiring the likelihood of plural destinations, and the combination does not require the vehicle to specifically be a hybrid. The subcombination has separate utility such as a route planning invention to determine plural waypoints (destinations) along a potential route.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 3661

A telephone call was made to Kurt VanVoorhies on June 20, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine M. Behncke whose telephone number is (571) 272-8103. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CMB

THOMAS BLACK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER